

WOLF CREEK

NUCLEAR OPERATING CORPORATION

551041

Otto L. Maynard
President and Chief Executive Officer

SEP 20 2001

RECEIVED

WM 01-0034

OCT 1 - 2001

Ms. Carol Hanlon
U.S. Department of Energy
Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office (M/S #025)
P.O. Box 30307
North Las Vegas, Nevada 89036-0307

Subject: Possible Site Recommendation For Yucca Mountain

- References:
- 1) 66 Federal Register 43,850 – August 21, 2001: Yucca Mountain Preliminary Site Suitability Evaluation
 - 2) Letters from Lake H. Barrett to David C. Wittig and Bernard J. Beaudoin dated August 27, 2001, and to Stephen E. Parr dated August 28, 2001

Dear Ms. Hanlon:

Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation (WCNOC), on behalf of its three owner utilities (Kansas Gas and Electric Company, Kansas City Power & Light Company and Kansas Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.), is pleased to submit these comments in response to the above references. WCNOC operates the Wolf Creek Generating Station, the only nuclear power plant in the State of Kansas. Wolf Creek, located in east central Kansas, likewise is owned by the above three utilities. Kansas Gas and Electric Company (KGE), a subsidiary of Western Resources, Inc. supplies electric service to about 294,000 customers in south central and southeastern Kansas. Kansas City Power & Light Company (KCPL) supplies electric service to about 470,000 customers in eastern Kansas and western Missouri. Kansas Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. (KEPCo) provides electric power to its twenty-one distribution rural electric cooperative members serving more than 95,000 electric meters in two-thirds of rural Kansas.

The Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) is also submitting comments on this subject on behalf of the nuclear energy industry. This letter also acts as an endorsement of the NEI comments.

First, we applaud the Department of Energy (DOE) for its progress toward licensing the Yucca Mountain High Level Waste (HLW) disposal facility by moving forward on a possible site recommendation for Yucca Mountain. Any progress toward this societal benefit is welcome indeed, even if long in coming.

Furthermore, we encourage the federal government to continue progress toward meeting its legal obligation to begin moving spent nuclear fuel to a central disposal facility. Through their utility bills, electricity users across the country have committed payments and interest of \$17 billion for this purpose. Customers of KGE, KCPL, and KEPCo collectively have paid over \$125 million of that amount since 1985. By DOE's own estimates, action by the federal government has already slipped at least 12 years past the 1998 contract target date for fuel acceptance.

Specifically, DOE asked that we respond to six suggested topics listed in Reference 2. Our comment format addresses those six topics.

1. **Please provide your views concerning whether the Yucca Mountain Preliminary Site Suitability Evaluation (PSSE) and other scientific documents produced by the Department provide an adequate basis for finding that the Yucca Mountain site is suitable for development of a repository. If you believe that certain aspects of the PSSE are inadequate, please detail the basis for this belief and indicate how the documentation might be made adequate with respect to these aspects.**

RESPONSE:

The amount of data collected and level of modeling and understanding of the proposed Yucca Mountain repository system as documented in the PSSE and other DOE documents have now evolved sufficiently to support a suitability determination. Forty years of global science and 20 years of specific study at Yucca Mountain support continued progress in this important environmental program. The Secretary of Energy and President Bush should have high confidence that taking the next step in the repository development process is the scientifically correct action.

In addition to DOE studies, our industry has conducted its own independent scientific repository evaluations through the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI). EPRI's scientific results confirm those published by DOE in the PSSE and its predecessor documents. In fact, EPRI results found DOE's analyses to be very conservative in some areas that included both natural and engineered systems.

2. **If the Secretary determines that the scientific analysis indicates that the Yucca Mountain site is likely to meet the applicable radiation protection standards established by the Environmental Protection Agency and Nuclear Regulatory Commission, do you believe that the Secretary should proceed to recommend the site to the President at this time? If not, please explain.**

RESPONSE:

Yes. The Secretary of Energy should proceed to recommend the site to President Bush at this time. A site recommendation is good energy and environmental policy. It is the responsible thing to do.

We believe the fact that Yucca Mountain will likely meet conservative Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) standards is assurance the facility will be protective of public health. In fact, one could easily argue the standards are too stringent given health risks associated with natural background radiation compared with health risks theoretically imposed by Yucca Mountain. As an example, natural radiation exposure from materials used in construction of the U.S. Capitol building would not meet the radiation exposure standards imposed at Yucca Mountain.

3. **Are there any reasons that you believe should prevent the President from concluding that the Yucca Mountain site is qualified for the preparation and submission of a construction license application to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission?**

RESPONSE:

No. The scientific evidence clearly shows that the site is qualified for the preparation and submission of a construction license application to the NRC.

A key point to be made is that approval by President Bush does not constitute approval of site construction or operation. It merely means approval is granted to submit an application to NRC for a construction permit. A rigorous NRC licensing process will then independently evaluate the design and operation of a repository at the Yucca Mountain site in three stages – construction, operation, and facility closure.

4. **If you believe that the Secretary should not proceed with a recommendation to develop a repository at Yucca Mountain, what mechanism should be utilized to meet the Department's legal obligation to begin accepting spent nuclear fuel and high level radioactive waste?**

RESPONSE:

We believe that the Secretary of Energy should proceed with a recommendation to develop a repository at Yucca Mountain. Twenty years of sound science supports a Yucca Mountain site recommendation.

The Secretary of Energy must meet the legal obligation to begin accepting spent fuel and high level radioactive waste regardless of what decision is made concerning Yucca Mountain.

The federal government has a long-standing legal obligation to manage used nuclear fuel as codified in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act in 1982. The courts have consistently upheld the federal obligation to remove spent fuel from reactor sites. This obligation is independent of DOE's repository program. Absence of a repository does not relieve the government of this obligation.

DOE's scientific investigation of Yucca Mountain shows that the site is safe for disposal of spent nuclear fuel and defense radioactive waste. Clearly, there now exists no scientific reason for the federal government to further delay the development of a federal repository. Electricity consumers deserve the disposal services for which they have paid.

5. **If you believe that the Secretary should not proceed with a recommendation to develop a repository at Yucca Mountain, what measures should the Nation consider for assuring safe disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high level radioactive waste?**

RESPONSE:

We believe that the Secretary of Energy should proceed with a recommendation to develop a repository at Yucca Mountain. Furthermore, we agree with the National Academy of Sciences in its June 16, 2001, report that Geologic Disposal is the only "scientifically and technically credible solution." International scientific consensus supports this concept.

6. **Please provide any other comments concerning any relevant aspect of the Yucca Mountain site for use as a repository, or that are otherwise relevant to the consideration of a possible recommendation by the Secretary.**

RESPONSE:

The world's inventory of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste is growing because of the continued use of nuclear energy, the dismantling of nuclear weapons, and an emphasis on cleaning up sites where these weapons were built. All these causes provide many societal benefits. The only part of the equation remaining is isolation of the waste to protect people and the environment from radiation. Simply stated, centralized disposal at Yucca Mountain is more protective than leaving spent fuel and high level waste in 40 states across the country.

A Yucca Mountain site recommendation is an integral part of an environmentally responsible energy policy. At the present time, 103 operating nuclear power reactors at 65 sites supply approximately 20 percent of our nation's electricity benefits without emitting any greenhouse gases.

On behalf of WCNOC and its owner utilities, I thank you for the opportunity to comment on DOE's possible site recommendation for Yucca Mountain.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact me at (620) 364-4000, or Mr. Tony Harris at (620) 364-4038.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Otto L. Maynard". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Otto" being more prominent.

Otto L. Maynard

OLM/rlr

Bernard J. Beaudoin
Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer
Kansas City Power & Light Company
1201 Walnut Street, 21ST Floor
Kansas City, MO 64141-9679

Stephen E. Parr
Executive Vice President and Chief Executive Officer
Kansas Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.
600 Corporate View
Topeka, KS 66615

David C. Wittig
Chairman of the Board, President and Chief Executive Officer
Western Resources, Inc.
818 S. Kansas Avenue, 11th Floor
Topeka, KS 66612

The Honorable Spencer Abraham
Secretary of Energy
U. S. Department of Energy
Forrestal Building 7A-257
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585

551041

The Honorable Bill Graves
Capitol Building, 2nd Floor
Topeka, KS 66612-1590

The Honorable Sam Brownback
303 Hart
Senate Office Building
Washington D.C. 20510

The Honorable Pat Roberts
302 Hart
Senate Office Building
Washington D.C. 20510

The Honorable Jerry Moran
1519 Long Worth
House Office Building
Washington D.C. 20515

The Honorable Jim R. Ryun
330 Cannon
House Office Building
Washington D.C. 20515

The Honorable Dennis Moore
431 Cannon
House Office Building
Washington D.C. 20515

The Honorable Todd Tiahrt
401 Cannon
House Office Building
Washington D.C. 20515

Vic Cooper
Public Health Physicist
Bureau of Air Qual. & Radiation Control
Division of Environment
KS Dept. of Health & Environment
Forbes Field – Building 321
Topeka, KS 66620

6